DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0573/160076.01
Application No.: 09/900,123
Office Action Dated: January 30, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22-41, and 58-76 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 58-76 stand rejected. Claims 4-5, 20-22, 27, 38, 64-65, and 76 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 23 and 61 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 58-76 stand rejected over 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,993,759 ("Aptus") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,314 ("Sweeney").

Regarding Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 4 and 5 and recites in part:

> utilizing an explicit interface member mechanism that enables a class to implement an explicit interface member by explicitly specifying the relationship between the class and the explicit interface member, wherein the explicit interface member mechanism enables an implemented explicit interface member to be excluded from a public interface of said class.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art fails to teach or suggest at least this subject matter. In the Office Action the Examiner stated that Aptus col. 22, lines 50-63 teach "wherein the explicit interface member mechanism enables an implemented explicit interface member to be excluded from the public interface of said class." Applicants disagree with the Examiner. According to Aptus, applications to be developed using [a] software development tool and collectively broken into three views of the application: the static view, the dynamic view and the functional view." (Col. 22, lines 4-7). Aptus also describes a fourth view that can be used called the architectural view. This view is modeled using package, component and deployment diagrams. Package diagrams show packages of classes and the dependencies among them. Component diagrams show the dependencies among software components, including source code components... Deployment diagrams show the configuration of run-

time processing elements and the software components, processes and objects that live on them." (Col. 22, lines 50-63). Applicants submit that this fails to teach or suggest the above stated subject matter. According to claim 1, when an explicit interface member mechanism is enabled, the explicit interface member is excluded from the public interface of the class, e.g., it can't be invoked from the class and a compiler will produce errors. Accordingly, since Apatus in view of Sweeney fails to teach or suggest at least the subject matter recited above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 2, 3, 6-15, and 17–19 depend directly or indirectly from claim they too patentably define over the cited art for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 2, 3, and 6 – 19.

Independent claim 23 and 61 recite similar elements to those in claim 1 and patentably define over Apatus in view of Sweeney for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 23 and 61.

Dependent claims 24-26, 28-37, 39-41, 58-60, 62, 63, and 66-75 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 23 or 61. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 24-26, 28-37, 39-41, 58-60, 62, 63, and 66-75 for at least the reason described above with respect to claims 23 and 61.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0573/160076.01
Application No.: 09/900,123
Office Action Dated: January 30, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: April 29, 2008

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439